REMARKS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated January 3, 2008, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1-3 and 14-16 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being allegedly unpatentable over Luciani, Jr. et al. (U.S. Serial No. 10/729,676, hereinafter "Luciani"); and 2) rejected claims 1-6 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Zhu et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0084169, hereinafter "Zhu").

With this Response, Applicants cancel claims 7-13. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. PROVISIONAL DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

Claims 1-3 and 14-16 are rejected provisionally on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting in light of claims 15-17 of Luciani. Because the rejection is a provisional double patenting rejection, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be held in abeyance at least until all other objections and rejections against this case have been resolved.

II. ART BASED REJECTIONS

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Zhu.

Zhu is directed to system and method for accessing a target computer form a remote location using a remote computer. (Zhu Title). In particular, Zhu teaches accessing the target computer using a remote computer by way of a central computer. (Zhu Paragraph [0008]). Before a user can access the target computer user account information is set up on the central computer. (Zhu Paragraphs [0029]-[0034]). Next, the target computer is set up for remote access by the user with user specific default remote session settings. (Zhu Paragraph [0042]). When the user accesses the target computer from a remote location using the remote computer, the user first establishes a connection with the central computer. (Zhu Paragraph [0055]). Once the user has established the connection with the central computer, a remote access session is started with the user specific default remote session settings. (Zhu Paragraphs [0062]-[0063]). Thus, Zhu appears to teach only default remote session settings, which were set up by

the user before accessing the target computer. Zhu is silent as to switching between a default remote session and a non-default remote session.

Claim 1, by contrast, specifically recites "switching between a default remote console session and a non-default remote console session." Applicants submit that Zhu expressly or inherently teach such a method. In particular, Zhu appears to teach accessing the target computer using the user default remote session settings; however, Zhu is silent as to switching between default and non-default remote sessions. Thus, Zhu fails to expressly or inherently teach "**switching between a default remote console session and a non-default remote console session.**"

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and all the claims which depend on claim 1 (claims 2-6) should be allowed.

B. Claim 4

Claim 4 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Zhu.

Claim 4 specifically recites that "the default remote console session is adjustable between a hardware-based remote console session and a software-based remote console session." Applicants respectfully submit that Zhu does not expressly or inherently teach such a method. Zhu teaches using remotes access software to access the target computer. (Zhu Paragraph [0020]). The remote access software runs on the target computer, the central computer and the remote computer. (Zhu Paragraphs [0019]-[0024]). Thus, Zhu fails to expressly or inherently teach that "**the default remote console session is** adjustable between **a hardware-based remote console session** and a software-based remote console session."

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 should be allowed.

C. Claim 14

Claim 14 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Zhu.

Claim 14 specifically recites that "the means for providing switches to a default remote console session from a non-default remote console session." Applicants submit that Zhu expressly or inherently teach such a system. Zhu

appears to teach accessing the target computer using the user default remote session settings; however, Zhu is silent as to switching between default and non-default remote sessions. Thus, Zhu fails to expressly or inherently teach that "the means for providing **switches to a default remote console session from a non-default remote console session.**"

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14, and all the claims which depend on claim 14 (claims 15-20) should be allowed.

D. Claim 17

Claim 17 is rejected as allegedly anticipated by Zhu.

Claim 17 specifically recites that "the default remote console session is adjustable between a software-based remote console session and a hardware-based remote console session." Applicants respectfully submit that Zhu does not expressly or inherently teach such a method. Zhu teaches using remotes access software to access the target. (Zhu Paragraph [0020]). The remote access software runs on the target computer, the central computer and the remote computer. (Zhu Paragraphs [0019]-[0024]). Thus, Zhu fails to expressly or inherently teach that "**the default remote console session is** adjustable between a software-based remote console session and **a hardware-based remote console session**."

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 should be allowed.

III. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark E. Scott/

Mark E. Scott
PTO Reg. No. 43,100
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(512) 610-3410 (Phone)
(512) 610-3456 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400